DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 310 698 HE 022 805

AUTHOR Crawford, John Stephens
TITLE Perry Levels and Belenky's Findings: Their Possibilities in the Teaching of Art and Art History.
PUB DATE 5 May 89
NOTE 31p.; Paper presented at the Getty Conference on Discipline Based Art Education (Austin, TX, May 5, 1989).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Viewpoints (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Art History; Art Teachers; College Students; Excellence in Education; Higher Education; *Intellectual Development; *Student Development; Student Improvement; *Teaching Methods
IDENTIFIERS Belenky (Mary F); Perry (William G Jr)

ABSTRACT

The Perry scheme of student development, as determined by William G. Perry, Jr. and his associates at the Bureau of Study Counsel of Harvard University, is discussed. His nine levels of development include dualism, multiplicity, and commitment. A study by Mary F. Belenky showed that Perry's students were almost exclusively male, and she noted that the reactions of male students and female students to the development they underwent differed significantly. Belenky's women depended much more on the successful parallel development of a positive self-concept to intellectual development. Six sections are as follows: the basics of the Perry model of cognitive development; additional research findings by Belenky and associates; race, ethnic group, and social class (since Perry's study was limited to white, middle- and upperclass males); the needs of students at different Perry levels (diversity, structure, abstraction, and closeness); Perry's and Belenky's models and the teaching of art and art history; and an art/art history course using Perry's and Belenky's findings. Both researchers' findings suggest a possible course which combines art and art history material while at the same time suggesting to young men and women what sort of developmental process they are undergoing. A reading list for an interdepartmental course on artistic and cognitive development is provided. Contains 8 references. (SM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED310698

PERRY LEVELS AND BELENKY'S FINDINGS: THEIR POSSIBILITIES IN THE TEACHING OF ART AND ART HISTORY

by

John Stephens Crawford (University of Delaware)

Paper Presented at the Getty Conference on Discipline Based Art Education, May 5, 1989

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
John Stephens
Crawford
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

HE 022 805

PERRY LEVELS AND BELENKY'S FINDINGS: THEIR POSSIBILITIES IN THE TEACHING OF ART AND ART HISTORY

by

John Stephens Crawford (University of Delaware)

I. THE BASICS OF THE PERRY MODEL OF COGNITIVE DEVELOPMENT

William G. Perry Jr., along with many associates at the Bureau of Study Counsel of Harvard University determined, on the basis of interpreted interviews with students at Harvard and Radcliffe in the 1960s that there is a common, underlying pattern to mental maturation in college students. This pattern has come to be called the "Perry scheme" (Perry 1970). Repeated studies since that time have confirmed the general usefulness of the Perry scheme of developmental attitudes and capabilities. However, important additional findings, which will be discussed below, have modified Perry's inferences, which were based on advantaged male students, in respect to women students, minorities and disadvantaged groups (Kurfiss 1988 with extensive bibliography).

The Perry scheme of development is divided into nine stages or positions, frequently referred to as "Perry levels." On the basis of present research, students do not seem to skip levels but to go through all of them. The rate of change is not constant, however. Three negative factors, termed "temporizing" (a pause in growth), "retreat" (regression to a previous position) and "escape" (fatalistic accep-

tance or gamesmanship) may cause students to regress or remain at a given level for a year or more (Perry 1970; Kurfiss 1988, 85). In some cases (albeit a minority) no further development occurs. Some students only reach the later Perry levels after they have finished college. Perry also suggests that similar developmental stages occur in different areas of people's lives throughout adulthood; he uses a helix to symbolize the pattern (Perry 1977, 97).

Put simply, students begin the college years in Levels or Positions 1-3, which Perry termed "dualism." Dualists believe that there is absolute truth and falsehood. Ethical standards are also absolute. Students want to be associated with and rewarded for being good and right. Authorities, such as teachers, are looked on as the possessors of absolute truth. Students in dualism see an antithesis between "we, right, good and other, wrong, bad" (Perry 1970).

In the second group of three positions (4-6), which Perry called "multiplicity," students are confronted with many alternative ideas, some of which conflict with each other. The students, however, have not yet developed logical ways of judging between alternatives, so they all seem equally valid. Thus, all opinions seem to have the same value, and authorities simply use their power in judging and rewarding students. Success seems to result from finding out what authorities want and delivering it.

In the final three positions (7-9), which Perry called "commitment," students recognise that knowledge is contextual and that all knowledge is open to challenge, but they must make at least tentative commitments in order to function in the world. Ethical standards exist by individuals' commitment to them, not by compulsory obedience. Rewards and status cannot be guaranteed. Authorities are seen as fellow seekers, attempting to make their best judgements on the basis of the knowledge available, despite knowing that knowledge is always incomplete. Students realize that authorities use logic and other forms of reasoning in trying to solve problems and evaluate things or situations, and they become able to use these methods themselves.

Dualism begins to change as students move to Level 2 (Perry 1970). Students then begin to recognise conflicts between authorities, a stage Perry called "dualism modified." Students try to resolve these conflicts by concluding that there are "good and bad" authorities. "Good authorities" solve problems and present problems which are soluble, but "the students must find out the answers by themselves" (Perry 1970). Presentation of an insoluble problem suggests to students that the authority is incompetent. At Level 3 students believe that there are some questions for which as yet even authorities have no sure answers. However, authority is working on the problem and will solve it.

In Level 4 there is the first great transition: from "dualism" to "multiplicity." "Multiplicity" means that students recognize many possible correct solutions for problems but lack any logical system for selecting between them. At this point choices and standards seem completely arbitrary. "Everyone has the right to his own opinion" (Perry 1970). Therefore, authority has no real legitimacy, especially in grading. Success seems totally determined by giving authority "what it wants" (Perry 1970). Students identify their own personal worth with authority's value of the students' work: "He gave me this grade, because he doesn't like me." Detachment and self-criticism are absent.

At Level 5 the second great transition takes place. "Mulitiplicity" changes to "relativism." "Relativism" is defined as the recognition of the contextual nature of right and wrong solutions. While knowledge is subject to change, not all ideas are equally valid. Logic emerges as a tool in selecting alternatives. Authority uses logic and comparison in order to make judgements.

Perry termed Level 6 "commitments in relativism" (Perry 1970). Students learn they must make choices within a relativistic framework. They learn to accept the uncertainty of incomplete knowledge and that certainty, acceptance and reward cannot be guaranteed. Students start to compare their own work to others' to try to understand authority's stan-

dards. The separation between personal worth and product begins here.

In Level 7 students start to make their first commitments, but to their surprise and frequent dismay, making a commitment does not resolve their doubts or produce the desired results.

In Level 8 students have multiple commitments and try to decide how deep or important these commitments are. Students at this stage are sometimes overwhelmed by the variety and uncertainty of the choices, in some cases concluding that logic has become useless to them.

Finally, in Level 9, which is often achieved after leaving college, students realize that their lives will continue to remain uncertain but can still be rewarding. They will be vulnerable but will have to make commitments to go on. As Perry says: "This is how life will be. I must be wholehearted while tentative, fight for my values yet respect others, believe my deepest values right yet be ready to learn. I see that I shall be retracing this whole journey over and over--but I hope more wisely" (Perry 1977, 79).

II. ADDITIONAL RESEARCH FINDINGS BY BELENKY AND ASSOCIATES

Some of Perry's critics pointed out that the students in his study were almost exclusively male. Only three female students were interviewed, and their material was not used in his book. Perry's subsequent studies of women seemed to

confirm the same model as for men. His study, however, was looking only for similarities between men and women students. Mary F. Belenky and her associates did studies on women students and non-students to see if there were differences in their development from men. Belenky's findings, published in Women's Ways of Knowing, showed that while the general pattern of the Perry scheme held true for women, the reactions of male students and female students to the development they underwent differed significantly, especially in respect to the three negative factors Perry described that inhibit development.

The men tended to identify with their teachers and to consider them as sources of knowledge whose methods of contrasting conflicting ideas and logical analysis they could learn and apply themselves. They saw themselves as potential authority figures. They came to enjoy competing with each other and their professors to win arguments and achieve status. They tended to see knowledge as something objective and separate from themselves and to separate emotional involvement from learning. Belenky and her associates referred to this as "separate knowing" (Belenky 1986).

Women, on the other hand tended not to identify with their teachers, especially if they were male. They usually regarded knowledge as arising from within themselves and specific to themselves. In other words, knowledge was subjective not objective and therefore could be intuited but not

analyzed and never fully communicated to others. They did not think of themselves as potential authority figures. Teachers who challenged women students to analyze their own ideas, or who contradicted an idea which a woman student had expressed, can seem very threatening, not just to her idea but her very sense of self. This threat can lead to an alienation from the whole educational process, increasing the risk of retreat, temporizing or escape.

Belenky's women, as opposed to Perry's men, depended much more on the successful parallel development of a positive self-concept to intellectual development. She reported interviews with "silent" women, who had been so brutally treated that their self-concepts were almost non-existent (Belenky 1986). Their thinking corresponded remarkably to Perry's "dualists," but they seemed unable to even conceive of self-development or a future.

Belenky described the self-development process for women as "gaining a voice" (Belenky 1986). This process first involved "received knowledge," then "subjective knowledge," and finally "constructed knowledge." Much of the received knowledge came from listening to others. Although the women exhibited many characteristics similar to Perry's dualistic men, the men tended to lecture rather than listen. Women tended to say "authority, right, they" rather than "we, right, good" (Belenky 1986, 44). They tended to think of themselves more as parts of a group than men, who tended

think of themselves as individuals. Women who were about to leave the "received knowledge" stage started to become dissatisfied with always subordinating their opinions and judgements to others. They felt the need to listen to themselves.

The early stage of "subjective knowledge" was personal intuition or, as one interviewee called it, an "infallible gut" (Belenky 1986). Like Perry's men, women are confronted with a baffling, sometimes threatening array of possible alternatives. Unlike the men, who asserted their own opinions to others forcefully, women developed an inner voice, a gut on which they depended to make decisions. The formal education women students received often seemed irrelevant to their day to day lives, problems and decisions. While dissatisfaction with education and authority also characterized Perry's multiplistic men, they tended to arbitrarily form opinions and defy anyone to contradict them. The women feared ostracism and were much more cautious in accepting multiplicity, hence they seldom expressed themselves publicly. Their restraint often prevented them from finding mentors who could aid in their intellectual development as easily as men. Alienated from the educational process, they tended to distrust logic, analysis, abstraction and language, all of which seemed to be masculine tools.

Later, women in the subjective knowledge stage severed old personal connections and tried to establish identities

that were theirs and not imposed by others. Young men regarded this process as something they were expected to do, even if conflict ensued. Women, on the other hand, found the conflict more painful between maintaining or breaking bonds. Eventually the women did break away with a greater confidence in their intuition and delight in the unusual or unconventional. Sometimes this resulted in aggressive assertion of the self, more often not. Since women tended to define themselves in terms of relationships, however, the severing of old ties caused an emotional roller coaster for their self-concepts. They still did not have a coherent system for judging issues, just as Perry's multiplistic men did not.

During the period of subjective knowing, women tended to think of themselves in terms of images rather than words in a private, imaginative language. These women listen rather than tell. But, Belenky says, these women gradually are gaining a voice, and it becomes manifest later (Belenky 1986).

Subjective knowing gives way to "procedural knowing." One of Belenky's most fascinating examples concerned a woman in an art history class (Belenky 1986). At first she felt it was "academic prostitution" to use the abstract terms of formal analysis to describe paintings to which she responded emotionally. Her first reaction was cynicism, "giving authority what it wants." As time passed in the course, she began to understand the terms of formal analysis as a way of

constructing her own knowledge of the paintings. Authority was not telling her what to say, rather providing a means of expressing the reasons for her intuitional feelings in words. Women at this stage experienced anxiety, because they were unsure of their new voices and uncertain about the validity of their former voices of intuition.

> Knowing requires careful observation and analysis. You must "really look" and "listen hard." Looking back in her senior year, Naomi gave credit to the art history handout for first "forcing" her to "look closely".... "Those basic, underlying principles have worked their way into the way I look at other things." (Belenky 1986, 94).

Belenky referred to students like Naomi as "separate knowers," who are able to detach themselves from the process of knowing, as men often do. But more women at this stage engage in what Belenky called "connected knowing," in which they try to understand differing views from theirs through empathy with the people who hold them. The difference is between someone who says: "The painting is saying this." and someone who says: "What is this painting (or artist) trying to tell me?" However, separate and connected knowing are not gender specific, although they may be gender related (Belenky 1986, 102).

The final stage Belenky called "constructed knowledge," and it is very close in some ways to Perry's "commitment" positions in men. Women at this stage realize that all know-

ledge is constructed and that they can construct it. They begin to realize that knowledge of the outside world and knowledge of self are inseparable. There is a difference between the "separate" and "connected" knowers, however (Belenky 1986, 104). Separate knowers analyze their self-concepts using logic. Connected knowers try to emotionally intuit undiscovered areas of self. Empathy and the importance of personal relationships deepen for women as their intellectual independence increases. For Perry's men, commitment usually takes the form of choosing a career and taking action to make it a success. Some women do this also, but when they do, they foresee a career in a context of personal relationships: "a life foreseen rather than a single commitment foreseen" (Belenky 1986, 150). They can tolerate ambiguity and the reality that achieving all their dreams is not possible. "They reveal in the way they speak and live their lives their moral conviction that ideas, like children, must be nurtured, cared for, placed in environments that help them grow" (Belenky 1986, 152).

For present purposes, Belenky's findings repeatedly stress the enormously important role art plays in women's self-concept formation. This is possibly the reason why so many young women are attracted to studio art and art history. There is no lack of role models for them in either of these fields, as there is in, for instance, mathematics. Works of art seem to also play a similar role in ego formation for at

least some men, and a curriculum which unite the developmental approach with art and art history could have immense value for many individuals.

III. RACE, ETHNIC GROUP AND SOCIAL CLASS

Another group of critics argued that Perry's study was limited to students who were essentially of one race (white) and the middle to upper socio-economic groups, in Belenky's terms, "advantaged males." Belenky and her associates' research on women, which included blacks, hispanics and also non-students tends to support the view that the Perry developmental model is generally valid, but that racism, ethnocentrism, sexual or social humiliation in education can seriously disrupt the developmental process, sometimes to the point where students drop out entirely. To the best of my knowledge, no one has ever tried to apply the Perry scheme to a group of black males. This is a serious omission, since Perry's model has been available since 1970, and the lack of black male students in higher education is a national concern.

Socio-economic and cultural advantages also have modified Perry's findings, when researchers applied his model nationally. He found very few dualists at Harvard, even among freshmen. Their education, travel, and general intellectual stimulation had already moved most of them into multiplicity. But research elsewhere in the country has

shown that at other universities the freshmen at least are predominantly dualist. This seems to be true for men and women; whites and minorities. Perry's original studies found that most advantaged males had moved into the commitment stage by their senior year, although some only reached the last level after leaving college. Studies elsewhere show that only forty percent of college seniors reach the Perry Level 9 (Kurfiss 1988).

From the guest teaching I have done in a high school (Salesianum School in Wilmington, Delaware) I strongly suspect that some high school juniors and seniors have progressed beyond Perry Levels 1 and 2 before they enter college. Granted, these students are not typical, but they exist. Some of them have surprised me by their precociousness, especially in their comprehension of abstractions in archaeology, such as stratification, while the other students were primarily concerned with the antiquity of the objects, their monetary value, or whether I got to keep them after I found them. Sex, the problem of drugs, and the desire for independence have forced many high school students to confront challenges to their intellectual and moral values in adolescence, causing them to move out of dualism.

IV. THE NEEDS OF STUDENTS AT DIFFERENT PERRY LEVELS

There are radically different capabilities and needs for students at either end of the Perry scheme. Students at

Perry Levels 1 and 2 believe that their role in the educational process is to receive information and demonstrate that they have learned the right answers. Because they believe that all questions have right and wrong answers, diversity of classroom approach or suggestions that there are many points of ambiguity in discussing or making works of art are unnerving and frustrating to them. Since diversity of approach is perhaps the most fundamental characteristic of art and art history, this presents a problem area for these students. At early Perry levels students expect a high degree of structure and are upset if they do not find it. Students at these levels have a very limited ability to comprehend abstractions, so conceptual approaches to art and art history do not quickly sink in, and the ability to make inferences or challenge the assumptions on which concepts are based is still undeveloped. They identify the value placed on their work with their personal worth. Criticism untempered by praise or reassurance hurts, and they really may not understand the reasons for instructors' judgements. What students want and need at these levels is a feeling of closeness to the instructor, since they believe authority is a sure guide to right and wrong, as well as the source of knowledge.

At Levels 5 and above in the Perry scheme, almost the opposite needs exist. Students at these Perry levels can tolerate ambiguity and want diversity of approach and ap-

preciate complexity of viewpoints in teaching. These students neither want nor need a high degree of structure and are capable of independent work. They can take criticism more easily, since they have learned to mentally separate themselves from their work enough to recognise their own mistakes, as well as those pointed out by their instructors. These students understand abstractions much more easily, therefore inferences, recognition of and challenges to assumptions come more easily too. What is the same as the early Perry levels is the need to feel close to the instructor, who is no longer believed to be an omniscient source of truth or knowledge but as a colleague engaged in the same enterprise.

Almost all instructors at the high school and college level entered a teaching career because of one or more mentor relationships with teachers in their years of education. Not all their teachers filled a mentor's role, nor could they. While there is an enormous variety of teachers' and students' personalities, the feeling of closeness determines the successful instruction of students at various Perry levels in the same classes. What seems to be a successful set of tactics is as follows:

1) reveal the process of mental development to the students by explaining that students will find some aspects of the material more difficult than others

2) reduce stress and competition and encourage students to work together

in small groups

3) balance challenge and safety to reduce students' discouragement

Successful education of artists and art historians requires repeated efforts on the parts of the instructors and an ability on their part to empathize with students at different Perry levels. Fresh minds must be educated by fresh minds. This is no easy task for teachers, since courses, especially beginning ones, repeat the same student mistakes year after year, while the many other demands of artistic activity, scholarship, and service pressure teachers in respect to promotion, evaluation, salary and respect within the profession. Nonetheless, this challenge must be met and mastered.

SEE DIAGRAM:

NEEDS OF STUDENTS AT EARLY AND LATE PERRY LEVELS

EARLY PERRY LEVELS

DIVERSITY HIGH------------LOW*

STRUCTURE HIGH------------LOW*

ABSTRACTION HIGH------------LOW*

CLOSENESS HIGH----------------LOW*

LATE PERRY LEVELS

DIVERSITY HIGH------------LOW*

STRUCTURE HIGH------------LOW*

ABSTRACTION HIGH--------------LOW*

CLOSENESS HIGH----------------LOW*

V. PERRY AND BELENKY'S MODELS AND THE TEACHING OF ART AND ART HISTORY

Perry did not specifically deal with students in any particular discipline. His model was developed for students in college as a whole. In nineteen years of teaching I have collected many statements made to me or to other professors in the Departments of Art and Art History at the University of Delaware, and a number of them were overheard as students spoke to each other. The statements below are those of both young men and women. In several instances very similar comments were made by different students, sometimes years apart. These comments are not professional interviews, of course, but I believe they confirm the Perry developmental model. Professional interviews of women teachers and students would undoubtedly be necessary to see whether Belenky's findings of negative factors in a male-dominated educational setting are typical of women art students.

Art and art history students at Level 1 believe that both disciplines are bodies of technique or knowledge that they can acquire; indeed, their parents are spending great sums so that they can. Some of them have already encountered parental and/or peer opposition to their career choice and their value of art. Thus, they may be even more dependent for approval and encouragement on their teachers than other students. Typical comments heard at this stage are:

The difference between bad and good art is that some people can draw and others can't.

Great art is profound, so I make art that deals with the big issues.

My parents think I'm crazy.

At Level 2 conflicts between different teachers' approaches become clear. Work that gets an A from one teacher gets a C and a tongue lashing from another. Students move into states of love or hate for their teachers and imitate them or regard their styles as invalid accordingly. When art students imitate their teachers' work or art history students depend too much on previously published material, they are criticised as derivative or unoriginal. Bewilderment and fury set in. Typical comments are:

Every great artist was a rebel.

No one has respect for my work.

Prof. X is great, Prof. Y stinks.

Just tell me what you want me to do.

What's really important in this course?

It didn't say that in the book. I don't know enough to know when the book's wrong.

There's only one way to paint, and that's the way I'm doing it.

In the case of the last comment there was an interesting sequel. Years later the student earned an MFA from Wisconsin and became an instructor at Rhode Island School of Design.

He made a special trip back to Delaware to apologize to the professor to whom he had said this, which suggests he had passed through a number of Perry levels in the intervening time. He told me: "I can't believe I said that."

AT Level 3 students begin to realize that there is no body of technique or knowledge that will guarantee them respect or success in art or art history. Further, they see that not everyone accepts the work of their teachers as good or even legitimate. However, students still believe that teachers are "on the track" of true knowledge of art or art history, because of their academic credentials or approval by other authority figures, such as peers, critics or patrons:

> *He must be right; he got his Ph.D. at Harvard.*
>
> *He must be good; he got his MFA at Cranbrook.*
>
> *It (an art historical exhibition) got so-so reviews.*
>
> *Did you read that review?! (of a painting professor's exhibition, expletives deleted).*
>
> *He gave me a C, and there's no one in that class who can draw like I can.*
>
> *One of these days some gallery will pick up his work.*

At Level 4 students frequently decide that, since authorities disagree even on a basic definition of art, any work they do is just as good or valid as any other in art or art history. Grading disputes abound. Some students become

cynical sycophants, believing that by imitating work praised by their teachers, they will get the grades they desire. Others forlornly grope for standards, accuse teachers of favoritism or careless arbitrariness.

> I don't see the difference between her paper and mine. I said the same things (i.e. included the same facts) as she did.
>
> Your views on art are just opinions. (Therefore) you can't give him an A and me a B. (Dispute about a grade on a drawing.)
>
> Success in art depends totally on doing what's "in."
>
> Every successful artist prostitutes himself.
>
> My teachers are second-raters on an ego trip.

At Level 5 art students begin to see that regardless of recognition or reward there are some concepts that good works of art have in common, and some of these are principles which can be used with profit in their own works. Art history students begin to recognise that some art historians try to support their views with evidence more than others, that some are superficial or try to force presuppositions on the evidence, but others produce models that fit all the facts better and offer new insights:

> The trouble with Wölfflin is that he believes all art history is like the Italian Renaissance.
>
> My problem is, I can't get the edge in this painting to work with the rest of it.

I'm trying to unite the piece coloristically, but in a way you won't notice at first.

Late antique portraits and Neo-Platonism do go together.

AT Level 6 students realize that in order to create they must commit themselves by choosing from the immense numbers of possibilities around them. The rewards are uncertain, the process sometimes frustrating or frightening, but students learn that art or art history is a series of choices made on the basis of the best available evidence.

At Level 7 art and art history students frequently do their first original work. Others may approve or disapprove, but students are now willing to commit themselves to their own ideas. They sometimes realize that they cannot do all the things they would like to do in a single work, single paper, single lifetime, so they force themselves to choose:

I've decided to give up painting for awhile and concentrate on photography. I was spreading myself too thin.

I still enjoy other periods of art history, but I really want to get deeper into medieval. That's what I'm really interested in.

In graduate school you have to have a special field, so I've decided to go on in American [art].

Dekom [a critic] didn't mention my paintings in the show, but they still look good to me.

At Level 8 the hard-won satisfaction of Level 7 is lost. On critical re-reading or re-looking students discover flaws in their own work, after it is too late to remove them. These artists or art historians, for the students are now mature, realize that fuller development must come in the future or often undergo a crisis in confidence.

> I thought I wanted the MFA, but now I'm afraid I won't get a job, even if I get one.
>
> I destroyed that painting I did last month. It looked good then; I can't stand it now.
>
> I'm into my senior thesis on Chartres cathedral, and the research bores me stiff! What am I going to do now?

At Level 9, which is usually reached after leaving school, the students realize that mental and artistic development is Perry's expanding helix. There will be no clear culmination.

> I am a part of history, and history is a part of me.
>
> Seeing great art makes me want to work.
>
> Looking at my old paintings doesn't bother me any more. They are O.K. for what I was doing then.
>
> I will never know what most people think of my work.
>
> This is the way I'm painting now, and I'm going to paint this way until I can think of a better way.

VI. AN ART/ART HISTORY COURSE USING PERRY AND BELENKY'S FINDINGS

Perry's model and Belenky's findings suggest a possible course which combines art and art history material, while at the same time suggesting to young men and women what sort of developmental process they are undergoing. In particular, Belenky's finding that women use works of art and the biographies or autobiographies of artists in the formation of their own self-concepts suggests that these works be included in such a course.

The aims of such a course would be:

1) respect for the creative attempts of individuals
2) awareness of the diversity of valid approaches to art
3) cultivation of the imagination
4) awareness of art as a unifying or divisive factor among people
5) awareness of art as a process of self-definition and development

The students in the course might read such texts as Anne Truitt's Daybook or Turn, Paul Gaugin's Noa Noa, and Gordon Parks's A Choice of Weapons. It is essential that students of both sexes and all racial/ethnic groups read all the books. A sufficient bibliography of artists' biographies and autobiographies exists so that teachers may choose among them according to a particular class's composition, or perhaps let the students choose for themselves among the readings.

Parallel to the readings would be studio projects in various media for all students. Teachers could offer technical help as needed by the students and do demonstrations related to the students' projects.

The students and the teacher(s) would then meet to discuss both the readings and the projects. The discussions should not be critiques but opportunities to examine differing approaches and reactions to the experiences of creation and self-definition and a gradual revelation to the students of the processes and levels of growth that Perry and Belenky have discovered.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

Belenky, Mary F., and Blythe M. Clinchy, Nancy R. Goldberger, Jill M. Tarule. Women's Ways of Knowing: The Development of Self, Voice and Mind. Basic Books: New York, 1986.

Gardner, H. Art, Mind and Brain: A Cognitive Approach to Creativity. New York: Basic Books, 1982.

Kurfiss, Joanne G. Late Adolescent Development: A Structural Epistemological Perspective. Unpub. Diss. University of Washington, 1975.

---------- "Sequentiality and Structure in a Cognitive Model of College Student Development," Developmental Psychology 13 (1977) 565-571.

---------- Critical Thinking: Theory, Research, Practice and Possibilities. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Reports No. 2. Washington, D.C.: American Studies in Higher Education, 1988.

Perry, William G. Jr. Forms of Intellectual and Ethical Development in the College Years: A Scheme. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston (1970).

----------, "Intellectual and Ethical Forms of Development," Pupil Personnel Services Journal, 6 (1977) 61-68.

----------, "Cognitive and Ethical Growth: The Making of Meaning," in Chickering, ed. The Modern American College 76-116. San Francisco: Joosey-Bass, 1981.

A READING LIST FOR AN INTERDEPARTMENTAL COURSE ON ARTISTIC AND COGNITIVE DEVELOPMENT

COGNITIVE DEVELOPMENT

Belenky, Mary F., and Blythe M. Clinchy, Nancy R. Goldberger, Jill M. Tarule. Women's Ways of Knowing: The Development of Self, Voice and Mind. Basic Books: New York, 1986.

Perry, William G. Jr. Forms of Intellectual and Ethical Development in the College Years: A Scheme. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston (1970).

ARTISTIC DEVELOPMENT

(Women)

Bourke-White, Margaret. Portrait of Myself. Simon and Schuster: New York, 1963.

Busch, Gunther and Liselotte von Reinken. Paula Modersohn-Becker, the Letters and Journals. Edited and translated by Arthur S. Weinsinger and Carole C. Hoey. New York: Taplinger and Co., 1983.

Mary Cassatt: An American Observer. New York: Universe Books, 1987.

French, Mary. Memoirs of a Sculptor's Wife. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1928.

Hepworth, Barbara. Barbara Hepworth--A Pictorial Autobiography. Bath: Adams and Dart, 1970.

Huisman, P. Morisot Enchantment. New York: French and European Publications, n.d.

Kollwitz, Hans, ed. The Diary and Letters of Kaethe Kollwitz. Translated by Richard and Clare Winston. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, c. 1988.

Krasner/Pollock: A Working Relationship. New York: Grey Art Gallery and Study Center, 1981.

Mathews, Nancy M., ed. Cassatt and her Circle, Selected Letters. New York: Abbeville Press, 1984

Truitt, Ann. Daybook: The Journal of an Artist. New York: Viking Penguin, 1982.

----------. Turn: The Journal of an Artist. New York: Viking Penguin, 1986.

(Black American Men)

Parks, Gordon. A Choice of Weapons. New York: Harper and Row, 1971.

Wheat, E.A. Jacob Lawrence, American Painter. Seattle: University of Washington/Seattle Art Museum, c. 1986.

(Caucasian Men)

Archipenko, Alexander. Archipenko: Fifty Creative Years, 1908-1958. New York: Tekhne, 1960.

Calder, Alexander. Calder: An Autobiography with Pictures. New York: Pantheon Books, 1966.

Gaugin, Paul. Noa-Noa. Translated by O.F. Theis. New York: Noonday Press, 1957.

Greenough, Horatio. Travels, Observations and Experiences of a Yankee Stonecutter. Gainesville: Scholars' Facsimiles and Reprints, 1958.

Klee, Paul. Diary of a Trip to Tunisia. New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1969.

Renoir, Auguste. Renoir my Father. Translated by Randolph and Dorothy Weaver. Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1958.

Smith, David. David Smith by David Smith. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968.

Van Gogh, Vincent. The Letters of Vincent Van Gogh. Edited and introduced by Mark Roskill. New York: Atheneum, 1967.

Zorach, William. Art Is My Life: The Autobiography of William Zorach. New York: Pitman Publishing Corp., 1938.